ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition by Tampa Electric Company) for Approval of Cost Recovery for a New) Docket No. 980693 EI Environmental Program, the Big Bend Units) 1 and 2 Flue Gas Desulfurization System) Filed: August 14,1998

LEGAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE FOUNDATION, INC. PETITION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE

Petitioner, Legal Environmental Assistance Foundation, Inc. (LEAF), requests leave to intervene as a full party in the above docket and states:

The name and address of the person who should receive notices, pleadings, orders and correspondence is as follows:

> Gail Kamaras Legal Environmental Assistance Foundation 1114 Thomasville Road, Suite E Tallahassee, FL 32303

- 2. How Tampa Electric Company (Tampa) treats sulfur dioxide emissions will substantially influence both the amount of air pollution emitted in Tampa's service territory and the continued CK _____ cost-effectiveness and lifespan of Big Bend units 1 and 2.
- 3. LEAF is a public interest advocacy organization with substantial interests that will be affected by Commission action in TR ____ this docket. The corporate purposes of LEAF include ensuring EG ____ environmental and health benefits for its members and the public. A substantial number of LEAF's members use and enjoy natural

DOCUMENT OF MAER -DATE

08686 AUG 148

IT IC BE OFFICE PERCETING

PP ____

CAF ____ -MU _____

(AG) Tew

RCH __

OTH OUR Bred

resources whose quality is at risk from pollution from electric generation facilities, including from the Big Bend power plant and are Tampa customers.

- 4. Petitioner disputes the fairness, justness and reasonableness of Tampa's compliance plan, recovery request and the timing of its request in that the cumulative cost effectiveness and environmental effectiveness of its proposal has not been demonstrated for reasons that include:
 - a. Tampa has not timely filed a petition for pre-construction prudency approval of its Clean Air Act compliance plan pursuant to section 366.825, Florida Statutes as required.
 - b. Big Bend is among the most polluting power plants in the state and, while LEAF generally supports use of flue gas desulfurization (FGD) equipment as the best available control technology for sulfur dioxide removal, it questions the validity and sufficiency of Tampa's compliance plan, including the cumulative cost and environmental effectiveness of continuing to operate Big Bend 1 and 2 versus other alternatives.
 - c. The addition of an FGD may provide an incentive to operate Big Bend 1 and 2 for a longer period (the units are 25 and 28 yearly old respectively), thereby allowing higher levels of air pollutants and increasing maintenance costs as those units

age further;

- d. While Tampa is reducing SO2 emissions from Big Bend 1 and
- 2, its plan to revert to purchase of higher sulfur coal will allow it to purchase up to 20,000 SO2 emission allowances. It is not clear that the cost savings from switching from low to

high sulfur coal will be more than the cost of allowances;

- e. Tampa has not included all probable environmental compliance costs in its alternatives analysis. For example, Tampa will be required to comply with federal and state regulations imposing stricter limits on nitrogen oxide (NOX) emissions and fine particulate emissions (PM 2.5) in the next several years. The cumulative cost of continuing to operate Big Bend 1 and 2 with all newly required environmental controls or under operational restrictions and additional maintenance costs has not been properly compared with the cost of alternatives; and
- f. Tampa has not shown that its natural gas alternative is the most cost-effective alternative.;
- g. Tampa's alternatives do not adequately consider additional energy efficiency measures or clean renewable technologies that could cost effectively reduce or offset its SO2 emissions.

Petitioner is entitled to relief under Chapters 120, 366 and 403,

Fla. Stat., and implementing regulations. Petitioner reserves the right to rely on additional statutes or rules should additional issues arise or become known.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner requests permission to intervene in this docket and be granted full rights to participate in all proceedings therein.

Respectfully submitted,

Sail Kamaras

Legal Environmental Assistance Foundation

1114 Thomasville Road, Suite E

Tallahassee, FL 32303

(850) 681-2591

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the Legal Environmental Assistance Foundation, Inc. (LEAF) Petition for Leave to Intervene has been furnished by hand delivery (*) or by U.S. Mail to the following parties of record on August 14, 1998:

Grace Jaye (*)
Florida Public Service Comm.
#540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

John Roger Howe (*) Office of Public Counsel 111 W. Madison St., Rm 812 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400

Lee Willis
James Beasley (*)
Ausley & McMullen
PO Box 391
Tallahassee, FL 32302

Vicki Kaufman (*) McWhirter Reeves 117 S. Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301

John McWhirter McWhirter Reeves PO Box 3350 Tampa, FL 33601

Angela Llewellyn Tampa Electric Co. Regulatory Affairs PO Box 111 Tampa, FL 33601-0111

Gail Kamaras

Legal Environmental Assistance Foundation, Inc.

1114 Thomasville Rd, Suite E Tallahassee, FL 32303

850-681-2591